

### REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6 and 8 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph is respectfully requested. It is believed that claim 3 is of different scope than claim 1 in that it recites the means for separating, which is a recitation pursuant to 35 USC §112, sixth paragraph.

Claim 1 has been amended to contain delete the objectionable passive recitations.

Finally, it is submitted that claim 1 is generic as to the source of the solvent that is added to the evaporator to maintain the temperature. In a preferred embodiment, it is indeed the solvent that has been earlier flashed off, but that is not a requirement of the claim.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 12-14, and 16-18 under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over Bowes in view of Cox and Aquila for the reasons previously set forth.

Applicant agrees that claim 8 is not limited to the step of adding solvent to the evaporator. Claim 8 is directed to the step of treating the bottoms by cooling them and then adding the supernatant from the cooled bottoms back to the evaporator. This step allows the liquid in the bottoms to be subjected to continued treatment to increase efficiency.

Thus, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

All necessary extensions of time are hereby requested. Please charge any deficiency and credit any excess to deposit account 50-1088.

Respectfully submitted,  
CLARK & BRODY



Conrad J. Clark  
Reg. No. 30,340

Suite 250  
1090 Vermont Ave., NW  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
202-835-1111  
202-835-1755(fax)  
January 12, 2009